UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/583,334 03/07/2007		Francesco Santangelo	U 016325-6	9753
140 LADAS & PAF	7590 12/01/201 RRY LLP	EXAMINER		
26 WEST 61ST NEW YORK, N	STREET	SPIVACK, PHYLLIS G		
NEW TORK, I	N1 10023		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1614		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/01/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

nyuspatactions@ladas.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)		
	10/583,334	SANTANGELO, FRANCESCO		
	Examiner	Art Unit		

	Phyllis G. Spivack	1614	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>08 October 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire a Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth hter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	n. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
<del></del>	but prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	001100
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NO		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	acted claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	oted claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12  5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	·	•	_
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		I be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>3 and 10</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	hefore or on the date of filing a No	ntice of Anneal will not	he entered
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a ).
10.	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Phyllis G. Spivack/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1614	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the terminal disclaimer filed October 8, 2010 has not been approved. Applicant is advised to use the form at the end of Chapter 1400 or the form paragraphs in 1490 or language that is clear and complies with the TD rule. More specific information concerning the proper filing of a terminal disclaimer is available through Jean Proctor at telephone number 571-2721040.

The objection to the disclosure is withdrawn.

In the last Office Action the rejection of claims 3 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Locatelli et al., Nephrology, Dialysis, Transplantation, in view of Droge et al., U.S. Patent 5,607,974, was maintained. It was asserted Locatelli teaches the administration of N-acetyl cysteine to treat oxidative stress resulting from hemodialysis in a patient undergoing hemodialysis. Applicant argues there is no reasons to think it cysteine could be substituted for N-acetyl cysteine.

The prior art (Atkuri et al., Current Opinion in Pharmacology) recognizes N-acetyl cysteine to be a prodrug for cysteine. The rejection of record under 35 U.S.C. 103 is maintained.